DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 672 TE 000 802

By- Squire, James R.

The Running Water and the Standing Stone.

Pub Date Jun 68

Note- 8p.; Reprint from PMLA, Vol 83, June 1968. An address given at the Modern Language Assn. General Meeting on English (Chicago, Ill., Dec. 27, 1967).

Journal Cit- PMLA; v83 n3 p523-9 June 1968

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50

Descriptors- *Changing Attitudes, College School Cooperation, Curriculum Development, Educational Innovation, *Educational Needs, Educational Theories, *Educational Trends, English Education, *English Instruction, *English Programs, Financial Support, Language, Literature, Rhetoric, Teacher Associations, Teacher Education

Today, the content-centered curriculum in English--emphasizing the in-depth, rational study of the nature and structures of literature, language, and rhetoric--is changing under the influence of a "new" English--emphasizing the student's experience and involvement with literature. Thus, although the content-centered reforms of the past decade have yielded solid accomplishments, the English profession can further improve American English education if it will now urgently concern itself with (1) strengthening the undergraduate and graduate curriculums for training high school and college teachers, (2) providing inservice training programs in English for school administrators, (3) achieving communication between college and public school English teachers, and (4) developing a reasonably united voice through strong state associations to speak out to administrators, politicians, and the public on the needs of English. (JB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED0 24672

PMLA

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Issued Six Times in 1968

VOLUME 83 JUNE 1968 NUMBER 3

THE RUNNING WATER AND THE STANDING STONE

JAMES R. SQUIRE

Published by the MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
62 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10011

TE 000 802

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY James R. Squire and Modern Language Assn. TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

THE RUNNING WATER AND THE STANDING STONE*

By James R. Squire, *University of Illinois*

LAST September at an International Curriculum Conference at Oxford University, John Goodlad, Dean of the School of Education at the University of California, Los Angeles, and one of the prime movers of American education, pronounced the requiem for what he called the "discipline-centered" curriculum movement which began in 1951. Just as Progressive Education and its late-blooming progeny, Life Adjustment Education, dominated American educational thinking from the Thirties to the early Fifties, so "discipline centered" curriculum reform, beginning with establishment of the National Science Foundation in 1951 and the MLA's FL program a year later, seems now to have run its course. Thus Dean Goodlad looks for new commitments and new values to shape our teaching efforts during the generation ahead.

English came late to the "discipline-centered" movement, profitting, even at times misled by the experience of our predecessors in the sciences and foreign languages. Valiant efforts to strengthen state certification requirements in English, initiated in 1955 by Don Tuttle, Eugene Slaughter, Autrey Wiley, and a host of regional leaders in English (not the least of whom is now Executive Secretary of the MLA), appear in retrospect to have been our initial national effort. "The Basic Issues Conferences of 1958" articulated professional concern and allied the great associations in the campaign of the past decade. The CEEB Commission on English pioneered with institutes for teachers of English. The Council's National Interest studies awakened the profession to the extent of the problem, and the programs which it outlined, with some important and necessary modifications, have dominated our thinking to the present time. Jerome Bruner supplied a cognitive psychology far more in keeping with our new concern with subject matter than the principles of behaviorist psychology popular early in the century. Northrop Frye and other critics educated a generation of our colleagues to think in terms of the underlying structure of literature. Charles Fries, George Trager, and Henry Lee Smith, then Noam Chomsky with radically different perceptions, turned the attention of linguists from matters of usage and method to the underlying structure of our language. The revival in rhetoric had a similar effect in composition. In retrospect, a remarkable coalescence of scholarly and professional interest distinguished efforts during the past decade to clarify the underlying principles of our subject and the priorities for its teaching in the schools.

The Office of Education supplied the money. Seizing upon the manifest successes of other disciplines, Sterling McMurrin, John F. Kennedy's first Commissioner of Education, sought ways to bring scholar and teacher together, inaugurated Project English, asked for professional and scholarly opinion, and commuting to Washington became a regular event for scholars in the English community. During the years that followed, we even persuaded a former NCTE Executive Secretary, an academic dean, and the chairmen of two major English departments to take leave from their scholarship and administrative duties to help within the U. S. Office. A former member of the MLA's Executive Council, Vice Chairman of ACLS, and recently President of NCTE was named to the OE's top advisory panel.

Fruition of this effort came in the work of twenty-odd curriculum study centers only now beginning to release their "discipline-centered" programs to the schools; in the expansion of substantive research in English Education and, to a lesser extent, large-scale scholarship in English; in the inauguration of the categorical institute and fellowship programs in English; in the great enlargement of state supervisory services in subject disciplines; in the funding of a tripartite English/ERIC clearinghouse; and in the national Guidelines for Teacher Preparation in English about which Professor Shugrue has earlier spoken. Throughout the period, NCTE and MLA worked closely and fruitfully together.

Has this "discipline-centered" spirit of curricular reform now run its course, even while thousands of schools and teachers remain relatively unaffected by its impact? Is Dean Goodlad right in asserting that some new educational crusade will replace the one to which we have devoted so much of our attention?

* An address given at the General Meeting on English in Chicago, 27 December 1967.

No careful reading of the facts can yield any other conclusion. Items:

(a) The issue of categorical aid became blurred two years ago when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and such other acts as the Educational Opportunities Act, outstripped Title III of NDEA as the Federal Government's principal medium for administering broad aid to local schools and state education agencies. By the time legislation for higher education came up for study, the opponents of subject categories, *à la* NDEA, and the opponents of categories implied by Federal priorities under ESEA (e.g., the tying of civil rights provisions to programs for disadvantaged) seemed to be singing the same tune. The words were different, but this significant fact was lost in the cacophony. And it was the discordant tune that carried the day.

The American people, speaking through their elected representatives in the Congress, this year declared themselves substantially for "general" or "non-categorical" Federal aid to education, even with continuing reservations about how this Federal assistance is to be administered. This is clearly the major message of the non-categorical Educational Professions Development Act, albeit the Congress has indicated its intent and the Commissioner his assurance that successful categorical programs (like those in English) shall continue. In the future the best that we can realistically press for is general assistance administered by state and local educational authorities, coupled with some Federal categorical aid in the national interest.

Already American educational innovators, understandably anxious to achieve a complete transformation of the schools along some dimension still seen only through translucent glasses, are speaking of institute programs based on "sensitivity training" for administrators and "task analysis and role differentiation" for teachers. During recent months, advisors to OE, and, I fear, even staff members in the Office uninformed of the Commissioner's own position, have publicly stated that the categorical NDEA institute program "has had no effect on American education." Such blatant disregard of the facts has been momentarily checked by direct challenge from leaders in English, but hard evidence on what we have accomplished must be assembled during the months ahead.

But the questioning of NDEA programs is only one sign of a shift in national attitude.

(b) Equally portentious is the reduction by almost fifty percent of Federal funds for strengthened subject supervision in state education agencies and the decision by the Congress to divert funds formerly earmarked for subject-oriented leadership to "project administration."

(c) This year for the first time in its history the National Science Foundation had to mount a major national campaign to save its budget from decimation by the Congress.

(d) This year for the first time in a decade we have no one representing our subject discipline on a major advisory panel to the U. S. Office of Education.

(e) This year, too—indeed this month—the National Educational Association abolished the prestigious Educational Policies Commission which only six years ago declared that the central purpose of education is to teach young people to think. The official announcement suggested that so many other agencies now deal with the purposes and priorities of the schools that an Educational Policies Commission is no longer needed. Perhaps so, but it is cold comfort to know what some of these new agencies are doing.

One of them, for example, seems to be moving toward collaboration between educators, psychologists, and biochemists to spell out the interrelations between chemical and educational influences on the human brain. A glimmer of this brave new world appeared in this summer's seminars on innovation in education sponsored by Government and Kettering Foundation funds, where distinguished psychologist David Kretch, having given "innovative rats" some "creative rat toys" and placed them in "educationally active and innovative environments," compared their brains, "both morphologically and chemically," with the brains of rats condemned to a "non-innovative," dull environment and reported that "innovative rats" develop healthier, better developed brains. Believing that certain drugs thus can have an inhibiting or stimulating effect on the brain's ability to learn, Kretch predicts: "Enzyme-assisted instruction, protein memory consolidators, antibiotic memory repellers, etc., are the things that will concern work sessions in the technology of the year 2000."

(f) This year, also, according to a recent report in *The Wall Street Journal*, courses and

programs in the humanities, within the area embraced by the North Central Association, have multiplied tenfold within the past six years. Where this is simply an inflated way of announcing that the teacher of American literature and his counterpart in American history now have to talk to each other, there is little cause for concern and perhaps some cause for joy. But where it means that for a year or more high school students can take, as an alternative to English, an interdisciplinary program based on a study of world civilizations or rooted in principles of aesthetic development, we have reason for thought if not cause for concern, the more particularly since schools seem moving toward such interdisciplinary offerings after a period during which the colleges have demonstrated by and large that such courses do not work.

(g) This year, indeed for the last two or three years, we are aware that the social revolution in this country demands new educational procedures and perhaps new educational content and that any instructional goal, however highly valued, which conflicts with efforts to open educational opportunities to the American Negro, must ultimately yield.

Surely change *is* in the air.

But change is reflected also in other important developments. I need not remind this audience of the shift in perception of our undergraduate students toward affective experiences in learning. Concern with engagement and involvement in learning, the new experimental student-run college courses, the search for emotional impact (whether psychedelic or not), reflects a quest for educational experience beyond the grasp of rational study of the structure of subject matter.

The deep, widespread national response to Herbert Kohl's *New York Review* essays on the imaginative learning of the slum child illustrates one kind of response; the efforts of ACE's Commission on Academic Affairs to restore "literary experience" to the undergraduate literature curriculum, another. Above all, the Anglo-American encounter at Dartmouth reflects the new stirring. Rigid concentration on subject matter, on structure, on knowledge and knowing, seems less than adequate for this "new English" of today. Albert Marckwardt states flatly, "The content-centered approach of the Basic Issues Conference has been replaced by an emphasis upon experience and involvement." Arthur Eastman adds: " . . . a preference for power rather than knowledge, for experience rather than information, for engagement rather than criticism." Is it not significant that the two books reporting the Seminar are entitled *The Uses of English* and *Growth Through English*? "Use" and "Growth" are the twin foci of our new perception, a perception rooted still in the sharp awareness of subject that has emerged during recent years, and in this to be distinguished carefully from the constructs of Progressive Education with which the new ideas are sometimes erroneously compared.

What I am suggesting is that the Dartmouth experience, coming at a moment when one wave of curricular reform seems to have spent itself, and another yet to be born, may stand at the watershed of a vast new effort to improve our schools and colleges. Again a coalescence of social, political, and educational forces is driving toward some new enterprise, and although we lack a psychological theory to undergird our rising concern with imaginative and emotional education, some new Jerome Bruner seems almost certain to arise.

If then we stand again at a crossroads, what should be the profession's response? We might begin by reminding ourselves of what we have already accomplished, for retaining achievements of recent years is dependent upon clearly identifying them. Some are unmistakable: a clearer perception of subject content in the schools; vastly strengthened curricular guides for teachers; more textually-centered programs in literature; the beginnings of genuine programs in literature at the elementary level; understanding that study of the English language involves something more than haphazard exercises in usage and parsing; solid new programs for preservice and continuing education; awakening awareness that the elementary teacher, above all, is a teacher of English; changes in college English and college education programs; the emergence of college departments to a national voice through the new ADE association; above all, the shift in the attitude of the public and profession toward developments in English today.

Let me cite a few facts. All come from the National Interest Study of 1960 and the new National Study of Undergraduate English Programs which Thomas Wilcox is completing for the Council, MLA, and other college associations.

In 1960, some 60.7 percent of all four-year colleges in the country admitted offering remedial English instruction. By 1967, the figure had declined to 31.2 percent. No doubt the burgeoning junior college programs account for some of this change, but strengthened high school preparation is responsible for more. Indeed, who could ask for harder evidence of improved instruction in the schools?

During the twenty-five years from 1935 to 1960, the percent of college English departments requiring course work in linguistics for future teachers of English rose from 10 percent to 35.5 percent. In the *seven* years thereafter, the percentage climbed to 59.6 percent. And this remarkable change in programs planned for teaching majors was paralleled by an equally dramatic shift in work required for the general undergraduate major. Whereas seven years ago, fewer than 20 percent of the colleges required general majors to complete course work in the English language, today almost 39 percent do so. What better sign of amelioration of relationships between the linguists and their literary colleagues?

The rise in required courses in advanced composition for teachers has been almost as pronounced: in 1960, 41 percent; in 1967, 55.3 percent.

But such change is not surprising, considering the emphasis that NCTE, MLA, the CEEB, the curriculum centers, and the NDEA institute programs have placed upon such requirements.

What indicates an even more remarkable transformation of the total undergraduate program for future teachers is comparison of all required courses for teachers. Let me carefully review the patterns.

In 1960, college departments ranked preservice requirements for teachers in the following order: English Literature (86.8%); American Literature (83.7%); Shakespeare (72.9%); methods in English (51.1%); advanced composition (41%); world literature (37%); linguistics (35.5%); period courses (20–32%); contemporary literature (21%). This was our assignment of priorities seven years ago.

Today, the entire spectrum of requirements has changed. Shakespeare, required still in 70.2 percent of all undergraduate programs for prospective teachers, is the course most frequently regarded as essential. American Literature is second with 69.1 percent of the departments reporting; linguistics is third with 59.6 percent, up by 24.1 percent from the percentage requiring it seven years before; advanced composition, fourth, required by 55 percent. Methods at 34 percent shows a marked decrease. English Literature, the survey course, has lost half its support. Whereas seven years ago it was required countrywide with some 86.8 percent of departments so reporting, a formal requirement today is maintained by only 46.8 percent. The remaining top ten requirements: period courses, 38 percent; contemporary literature, 14.9 percent—both relatively unchanged; and world literature down to 10 percent from a high of 37 percent seven years ago.

Any reading of these comparisons will indicate what has happened. The reassessment of subject of the past ten years has spawned basic reevaluation of preparation programs for teaching. Survey courses and others rooted in the broad coverage approach have yielded to courses providing for study of literature in depth. Knowledge of the nature and structure of literature, rather than knowledge about literature, is becoming the standard, and as a result more options and more choices are opening for our students. It matters less which course in literature than that they learn what literature is. Hence, the concentrated study of fewer authors coupled with application of modern critical approaches are replacing the coverage requirements of yesteryear. In addition, solid preparation in rhetoric and language has become a major goal.

Who could ask for more substantial evidence of the impact of categorical institutes and the discipline-centered reform movement on the nation's departments of English. *From this day forward, let no assertion to the contrary remain unchallenged.*

But we should be remiss as a profession if we remain complacent in the face of either accomplishment or change. The climbing of one mountain more likely reveals another peak ahead, rather than a plateau. Let me mention only a few of my own urgent concerns.

(1) The requirement of courses by name is one thing. Providing the quality of instruction that the name suggests is another. Assuring that instruction achieves intended results is still a third concern. The nation's English departments still graduate too many teachers who have learned more about language and literature than have learned what either is. Nothing in the Wilcox Study suggests that we have yet attained, except in a few exemplary

departments, the intelligible incremental undergraduate curriculum in English about which Wayne Booth wrote three years ago in *The College Teaching of English.*

(2) The education of scholars and leaders is another compelling problem, and one can hope that Don Cameron Allen's study of the Ph.D., soon to be released, may generate reforms in our graduate schools similar to those we have seen recently at lower levels. Certainly Allen's discovery that only 25 percent of the Ph.D. candidates in English ever publish anything once they complete their dissertations should silence forever those who see no place in graduate schools for teaching future college teachers how to teach. The Wilcox discovery that 66.5 percent of our four-year colleges say they base promotion primarily on teaching effectiveness (and that only 10.4 percent mentioned publication as the first criterion) raises further questions. At a time when the demands of burgeoning college enrollments call for preparation of more and more undergraduate teachers, at a time when even our great graduate schools (at least the public institutions) may have to fight for financial support to maintain the quality of present programs, at a time when the shift from rural to urban economy has replaced the agricultural experiment station with the community college as the major service institution in each local community, at a time indeed when virtually each Congressman in Washington seeks to have a two-year college in his own district to which he may be more responsive than to any other institution of higher learning—at such a time can our great graduate schools afford to ignore the social and economic demands that they produce more college teachers?

(3) Advanced preparation for leaders in the teaching of English is vitally important as well, the more so if we are to build on the progress of recent years. I had hoped by this time that MLA and NCTE would be well embarked on a study of the Ph.D. in English Education, paralleling the Don Cameron Allen Study of the traditional Ph.D. Not only is such advanced work required for future methods instructors but for state and large district supervisors as well. And to accomplish the permanent reform of American English education, such study must be in English literature and language, no less than in selected dimensions of education. Fortunately, the Conference on English Education, with NCTE and MLA support, seems to be moving toward sponsorship of a major study.

(4) I would urge, too, that colleges take advantage of new non-categorical legislation for institutes and open their programs to school administrators. We all know that an informed, sympathetic administrator is the key to curriculum progress and instructional change in any school. We know that educational administrators are *not* by and large opposed to university-centered programs to upgrade teachers. (After all, they seek extension courses for teachers, retain university specialists to conduct inservice training and lectures, and in at least half the nation's districts require university credit courses, usually at the graduate level, as a requirement for the salary advancement of teachers.) Let us recognize then that the majority of school district administrators cannot possibly oppose categorical institute programs as such. If they quarrel with what we have been doing, it may be because too many teachers are learning too much too soon and are therefore outstripping their administrators and general curriculum directors. If institute programs were (or had been) modified to provide short-term briefing courses for administrators and curriculum directors in the same fields in which intensive study was provided for teachers, the climate for change in the schools could have been much more favorable. Industry long ago learned not to give specialized training to junior executives without briefing the senior executives in the same thing. Have we perhaps limited the effectiveness of our programs by not following just this pattern?

(5) I suggest, further, that we need to spend more time, not less, on articulation with the schools. I am appalled by statistics in the Wilcox Study which indicate that 77 percent of our college English departments offer or participate in preparation programs for teachers of English and 50 percent offer even the college methods course, yet 56.7 percent of all departments admit "no program of articulation" with lower levels and a substantial number say they have "almost no contact" with the schools. I can no more conceive of a truly effective preparatory program being controlled by a faculty without direct contact with school teachers than I can conceive of an effective school English program without direct contact with college scholars of English. Our subject is no simple body of content and theory to be walled

away from today's social, cultural, and educational concerns. This, above all, we can learn from Herbert Muller's Dartmouth book. At a time, too, when undergraduate institutions face enormous problems in staffing just to meet the immediate demands of ever-increasing hoards of students; at a time when the shift away from a "discipline-centered" curriculum, as we have known it, may seem to lessen the interest of school teachers in working with college scholars—at such a time, the isolation of college faculties from contact with the school is a dangerous omen. No development will sooner undercut much that we have achieved in American education than a retreat of college departments from assuming their share of responsibility for the entire spectrum of English instruction.

(6) Finally, I should like to urge that the college members of MLA and NCTE, those basically concerned with the teaching of our subject and with the intelligent use of taxpayer funds for the teaching of our subject, unite with the subject teachers of their states in developing strong state associations to genuinely represent the interests of our profession. With most future Federal support for education almost surely flowing through state departments of education, the need for strong, unified state voices is clear. We need not worry about English receiving its share of funds. Already it occupies some 25 percent of the total instructional budget. But we must worry instead about the ways in which these funds are spent, about the "innovations" constantly sponsored, about expenditures on machines and new asphalt paving when children still lack adequate books to read, about the potential implications if administration of funds for projects in higher education is assigned to local and state school officials who often lack real knowledge of whom to turn to for advice in English even in their own locales. Only this month two representatives, one from a university, the other from a local school system, explored with NCTE the possibility of Council administration of an imminent $200,000 grant because the local school system would be ineligible to receive the grant, because the University's overhead was prohibitive, and because the state department of education—otherwise a perfectly appropriate agency to receive and administer the grant—might have exerted political pressures on the direction of the project, but inevitably would have insisted on earmarking a substantial portion of the grant for short-term, intensive workshops in "sensitivity training."

The state departments need our help, and my experience suggests that they would welcome it. They need the perspective that can come from an independent view of what they are doing and should do in English. In each state, we as a profession need a firm, carefully reasoned voice to point out the implications of their actions. We need to say, for example—and I might add, say to about twenty states in the nation—that any state department of education which enforces single statewide adoption of textbooks—or even limited alternate adoptions—and which enforces such textbook choices over a four or five year period—*and* which also applies for funds to encourage "innovation" in curriculum content is clearly guilty of pork barrelling and may be guilty of fraud.

But we can speak frankly in this way only if we have a reasonably united independent profession in each state which brings together school and college interests. The state superintendent will listen to a soloist, not a dissonant choir. Some forty-eight state English associations currently are organized, but in few are college and university professors playing a significant role. Considering the direction in which the economic support of American education is moving, I can think of few more urgent tasks facing MLA and NCTE than strengthening these independent state associations.

These then are a few of the basic concerns which I commend to professional attention today. Others surely many of you would add.

I have tried to say that this moment in our professional history seems to be a moment for taking stock and for fashioning new directions. If the force of what Dean Goodlad sees as the "discipline-centered" curriculum effort has largely spent itself, if we can enjoy the satisfaction of at least partial achievement of some of our recent goals, we can perhaps at this moment of change in American educational effort see again that the past is prologue for the work that remains to be done. Howard Nemerov in his sensitive lyric "A Spell Before Winter" observes that "after the red leaf and the gold" of autumn have gone and "the land sinks deeper into silence," and "darker into shade," comes a time for taking stock, for perceiving clearly the elemental nature of life,

"the certain simplicities" exposed—"the yellow haze of the willow, the black smoke of the elm," and most basic of all, "the running water and the standing stone."

If the flowering of our discipline-based curriculum effort has now yielded before the winds and rains of changing educational need, let us not face a winter of discontent before the resurgence of another spring. Let us rather use this interval to strip away the ambiguous pressures which so often cloud clear perception and look again at the nature of our discipline, our solid, bedrock "standing stone," and the currents of educational and social change that wash over it in our time. For as Nemerov says in speaking of such moments of truth and insight,

> It is the cold, wild land that says to you
> A knowledge glimmers in the sleep of things.